FILE COPY

Office - Supreme Court, U. S.
FILED
JAN 13 1939
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1938.

No. 591

BETHLEHEM STEEL COMPANY,
Petitioner,

against

ANGLO-CONTINENTALE TREUHAND, A. G., a Liechtenstein corporation, N. V. ANGLO-CONTINENTALE TRUST MAATSCHAPPIJ (ANGLO-CONTINENTAL TRUST COMPANY), a Netherlands corporation, MONDIALE HANDELS-UND VERWALTUNGS, A. G., a Liechtenstein corporation, and HYDROPRESS HANDELS, A. G., a Liechtenstein corporation,

Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AND CONSENT THERETO BY RESPONDENTS

FREDERICK H. WOOD,
WM. D. WHITNEY,
Counsel for Petitioner,
15 Broad Street,
New York, N. Y.

INDEX

	PAGE
Summary Statement	2
Statement	3
Reasons Relied on for the Allowance of the Writ	4
I—A State Court has decided a Federal question of substance not heretofore determined by this Court	4
II—A State Court has decided a Federal question of substance in a way probably not in accord with applicable decisions of this Court	6
Statement of Respondents	9
Appendix	11

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1938.

No.

BETHLEHEM STEEL COMPANY,
Petitioner,

against

ANGLO-CONTINENTALE TREUHAND, A. G., a Liechtenstein corporation, N. V. ANGLO-CONTINENTALE TRUST MAATSCHAPPIJ (ANGLO-CONTINENTAL TRUST COMPANY), a Netherlands corporation, MONDIALE HANDELS-UND VERWALTUNGS, A. G., a Liechtenstein corporation, and HYDRO-PRESS HANDELS, A. G., a Liechtenstein corporation,
Respondents.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

The Honorable Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

Bethlehem Steel Company respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review a judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of New York, entered in the above-entitled case, January 12, 1939, upon the remittitur of the Court of Appeals of the State

of New York reversing a judgment of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, which reversed a judgment at Special Term of said Supreme Court of the State of New York.

The opinion of the Court of Appeals was rendered *per curiam* January 11, 1939, and is unreported (R. 165). It followed the opinion of the same Court on the same day, per Judge O'Brien, with dissenting opinion by Judge Finch (in which Judge Hubbs concurred), in the related case of *Zurich Accident, etc., Co.* v. *Bethlehem Steel Company*. The Appellate Division wrote no opinion, but the decision and the dissenting opinion in the Appellate Division in the related case of *Zurich Accident, etc., Co.* v. *Bethlehem Steel Company* are reported in the record in that case, filed simultaneously herewith, at page 101. The opinion of Mr. Justice Hofstadter at Special Term is reported at R. 129.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

This case involves the question presented in No. 384 in this Court, *Guaranty Trust Company of New York* v. *Berryman Henwood, viz.*:

> Does Public Resolution No. 10 of the 73rd Congress (48 Stat. at L. 112) apply to coupons detached from corporate bonds expressed to be alternatively payable in a fixed number of dollars in gold coin of the United States of America at New York and a fixed number of units of a foreign currency at a foreign city, so that a respondent who has demanded payment in the foreign currency is limited in recovery to the number of dollars denominated in the bond, notwithstanding the fact that the value in dollars of the number of units of the foreign cur-

rency denominated in the bond exceeds that number of dollars?

In the present case, Mr. Justice Hofstadter answered the question in the negative at Special Term (R. 129). The Appellate Division of the First Department reversed, with two Justices dissenting (R. 158). The Court of Appeals reversed the decision of the Appellate Division, with two Judges dissenting, and reinstated the decision at Special Term (R. 165).

STATEMENT

The bonds issued by petitioner, from which the coupons involved in this case were detached, carried coupons in the following form (with appropriate insertions in the blank spaces) (R. 44):

On the first day of , 19 ,	$25.00
unless the Bond, hereinafter mentioned,	£5.2.10
shall have been called for previous redemption	62.25 Guilders

BETHLEHEM STEEL COMPANY

will pay to bearer at its office, or agency, in the City of New York, U. S. A., Twenty-Five Dollars, United States Gold Coin, or in London, England, Five Pounds, Two Shillings, Ten Pence, or in Amsterdam, Holland, Sixty-Two Guilders Twenty-Five Cents, being six months interest then due on its First Lien and Refunding Mortgage Five Per Cent. Thirty-Year Gold Bond.

$25.00 Series A No.

(signed)—B. H. JONES, Treasurer No.

After June 5, 1933, the date of the approval of Public Resolution No. 10, the respondents, corporations of the Netherlands and of Liechtenstein, presented their respective coupons (which by their terms were payable after June 5, 1933) for payment in Amsterdam and demanded payment in Dutch guilders. The petitioner refused to meet the demand; whereupon the respondents brought action in the Supreme Court of the State of New York to recover the dollar value of the Dutch guilders which it claimed should have been paid when these coupons were presented for payment, and moved for a summary judgment.

Mr. Justice Hofstadter granted such summary judgment for the value of the guilders measured at the date of maturity of the respective coupons; and his decision (R. 129), though reversed by the Appellate Division (R. 158) (per Justices O'Malley, Townley and Cohn, with Justices Untermyer and Callahan dissenting), was reinstated by the Court of Appeals (R. 165) (Judges Finch and Hubbs dissenting); and summary judgment was accordingly entered against the petitioner.

Reasons Relied on for the Allowance of the Writ

I

A STATE COURT HAS DECIDED A FEDERAL QUESTION OF SUBSTANCE NOT HERETOFORE DETERMINED BY THIS COURT.

The question of application of Public Resolution No. 10 to corporate bonds of precisely this character has been in litigation in numerous courts, and has given rise to a remarkable diversity of opinion, but has not yet been the

subject of any action in this Court other than the denial of a petition for writ of certiorari in *Henwood* v. *Anglo-Continentale Treuhand, A. G.*, 298 U. S. 655, and the grant of a petition for a writ of certiorari in *Guaranty Trust Company of New York* v. *Henwood*, Oct. T. 1938, No. 384. Before its decision by the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, the precise question had been before three United States Circuit Courts of Appeals. The 9th Circuit Court of Appeals avoided a determination of the main question by reversing the decision of Judge Lindley, 10 Fed. Supp. 953 (which had been favorable to the respondents here), deciding the case upon a procedural ground, *Southern Pacific Co.* v. *McAdoo*, 82 F. (2d) 121. The 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals decided in favor of the respondent's position in *Anglo-Continentale Treuhand, A. G.*, v. *St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company*, 81 F. (2d) 11; and the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals expressly disagreed with it, *Guaranty Trust Company of New York* v. *Henwood*, 98 F. (2d) 160.

The question had been before the Appellate Division of the First Department of the State of New York four times. That Court in each case sustained the petitioner's position,—one Justice (of a court of four) dissenting in the first case, and two Justices (of a court of five) dissenting in the last two cases. *City Bank Farmers Trust Co.* v. *Bethlehem Steel Co.*, 244 App. Div. 634; *Anglo-Continentale Treuhand, A. G.*, v. *Southern Pacific Co.*, 251 App. Div. 803; *Zurich General Accident & Liability Insurance Company, Limited* v. *Lackawanna Steel Co.*, 254 App. Div. 839; and *Anglo-Continentale Treuhand, A. G.*, v. *Bethlehem Steel Co.* (this case), 254 App. Div. 844. The Court of Appeals has now reversed the Appellate Division, with two Judges (of a court of seven) dissenting.

We submit that it is rare for a case to reach this Court in which there has been a greater diversity of judicial opinion. The question appears to merit not merely actual decision by this Court (which might in any event be obtained in No. 384), but an opportunity to the parties in the New York State Court litigation to be heard in the presentation of the case to this Court. In other words, whether or not another case which may involve the same question be already here, it would seem that the discretion of this Court should be moved to permit argument before it by the parties which have litigated an important federal question before two state appellate courts that have expressly disagreed—and in each court with two dissenting judges.

In addition, petitioner's counsel (by leave of Court) filed a brief and took part in the oral argument before the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals. See 98 F. (2d) 160, 161.

Finally, it is possible that the decision in No. 384 may go off on a ground different from that on which a decision in this case would be based. See the brief of the respondent in that case in opposition to the petition for writ of certiorari therein. In that event, it would be necessary to grant a review of the cases in the State court, if the federal question is to be decided.

II

A STATE COURT HAS DECIDED A FEDERAL QUESTION OF SUBSTANCE IN A WAY PROBABLY NOT IN ACCORD WITH APPLICABLE DECISIONS OF THIS COURT.

The adverse opinion of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York is based on an expressed agreement with the opinion of the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals in

Anglo-Continentale Treuhand, A. G., v. *St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co.*, 81 F. (2d) 11. The same is true of the dissenting opinion in the intermediate appellate court in New York State (R. 101 in *Bethlehem Steel Company* v. *Zurich, etc. Co.*, submitted simultaneously herewith). Neither opinion gave adequate, or indeed any, consideration to the *language* of the opinions of this Court in *Norman* v. *Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.*, 294 U. S. 240, and related cases, and *Holyoke Water Power Company* v. *American Writing Paper Company*, 300 U. S. 324, which (we submit) determined that cases of the character of this case,—*viz.*, cases involving particular applications of Public Resolution No. 10,—should be determined with a view to effectuating the intent of the Congress as therein set forth.

Indeed, neither in the opinion of the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals, nor in the opinions of the judges of the courts of the State of New York which have accepted it, do we find any real consideration either of the language of Public Resolution No. 10 or of its spirit.

But in the able and comprehensive opinion of Mr. Justice Rosenman at Special Term in the *Zurich Accident & Indemnity Co.* case, 164 Misc. 498, 299 N. Y. Supp. 862 (decided by the Court of Appeals at the same time as the present case), we find a convincing discussion of the language of Public Resolution No. 10, upholding its plain applicability to the state of facts presented in this case. And in the equally able and comprehensive opinion of Judge Stone for the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals in *Guaranty Trust Company* v. *Henwood*, 98 F. (2d) 160, we find a full discussion of the spirit of the Resolution as expressive of the intent of Congress, as interpreted in the light of the opinions of this Court above referred to:

Norman v. *Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.*, 294 U. S. 240, and *Holyoke Water Power Company* v. *American Writing Paper Co.*, 300 U. S. 324.

Wherefore, your petitioner respectfully prays that a Writ of Certiorari be issued out of and under the seal of this Court, directed to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, New York County, commanding said court to certify and send to this Court, on a day to be designated, a transcript of the record and of all proceedings in this cause, to the end that this cause may be reviewed and determined by this Court; that the judgment of the court below be reversed; and that the petitioner be granted such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

Dated, New York, N. Y., January 13, 1939.

FREDERICK H. WOOD,
WM. D. WHITNEY,
Counsel for Petitioner,
15 Broad Street,
New York, N. Y.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1938.

No.

BETHLEHEM STEEL COMPANY,
Petitioner,
against
ANGLO-CONTINENTALE TREUHAND, A. G., a Liechtenstein corporation, N. V. ANGLO-CONTINENTALE TRUST MAATSCHAPPIJ (ANGLO-CONTINENTAL TRUST COMPANY), a Netherlands corporation, MONDIALE HANDELS-UND VERWALTUNGS, A. G., a Liechtenstein corporation, and HYDROPRESS HANDELS, A. G., a Liechtenstein corporation,
Respondents.

STATEMENT OF RESPONDENTS

Now come ANGLO-CONTINENTALE TREUHAND, A. G., N. V. ANGLO-CONTINENTALE TRUST MAATSCHAPPIJ (ANGLO-CONTINENTAL TRUST COMPANY), MONDIALE HANDELS-UND VERWALTUNGS, A. G. and HYDROPRESS HANDELS, A. G., and state that they do not oppose the granting of a Writ of Certiorari herein. However, Respondents expressly do not accept or agree to, but on the contrary disagree with, the statements and arguments con-

tained in the foregoing petition, except only the statement of the proceedings heretofore had herein.

Respondents respectfully submit that the decision of the Court of Appeals is correct and direct this Court's attention to the case of *Anglo-Continentale Treuhand, A. G.* v. *St. Louis Southwestern Railway Company*, 81 F. (2d) 11, cert. den. 298 U. S. 655, which Respondents believe sets forth the correct governing law upon the question decided by the Court of Appeals of the State of New York.

Respondents also respectfully call the attention of this Court to the fact that there were other questions presented in this case to the Court of Appeals which that court apparently did not deem it necessary to decide in view of its decision in respect of the non-applicability of the Joint Resolution of Congress to the Coupons here sued upon.

Dated, New York, January 12, 1939.

HARRY HOFFMAN,
Attorney for Anglo-Continentale Treuhand, A. G., N. V. Anglo-Continentale Trust Maatschappij (Anglo-Continental Trust Company), Mondiale Handels-Und Verwaltungs, A. G. and Hydropress Handels, A. G.,
30 Pine Street,
New York, N. Y.

APPENDIX

Public Resolution No. 10

73rd Congress

48 Stat. at L. 112

JOINT RESOLUTION

To assure uniform value to the coins and currencies of the United States.

Whereas the holding of or dealing in gold affect the public interest, and are therefore subject to propor regulation and restriction; and

Whereas the existing emergency has disclosed that provisions of obligations which purport to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of coin or currency of the United States, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, obstruct the power of the Congress to regulate the value of the money of the United States, and are inconsistent with the declared policy of the Congress to maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar, coined or issued by the United States, in the markets and in the payment of debts. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) every provision contained in or made with respect to any obligation which purports to give the obligee a right to require payment in gold or a particular kind of

coin or currency, or in an amount in money of the United States measured thereby, is declared to be against public policy; and no such provision shall be contained in or made with respect to any obligation hereafter incurred. Every obligation, heretofore or hereafter incurred, whether or not any such provision is contained therein or made with respect thereto, shall be discharged upon payment, dollar for dollar, in any coin or currency which at the time of payment is legal tender for public and private debts. Any such provision contained in any law authorizing obligations to be issued by or under authority of the United States, is hereby repealed, but the repeal of any such provision shall not invalidate any other provision or authority contained in such law.

(b) As used in this resolution, the term "obligation" means an obligation (including every obligation of and to the United States, excepting currency) payable in money of the United States; and the term "coin or currency" means coin or currency of the United States, including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations.

SEC. 2. The last sentence of paragraph (1) of sub-section (b) of section 43 of the Act entitled "An Act to relieve the existing national economic emergency by increasing agricultural purchasing power, to raise revenue for extraordinary expenses incurred by reason of such emergency, to provide emergency relief with respect to agricultural indebtedness, to provide for the orderly liquidation of joint-stock land banks, and for other purposes", approved May 12, 1933, is amended to real as follows:

"All coins and currencies of the United States (including Federal Reserve notes and circulating notes of Federal Reserve banks and national banking associations) heretofore or hereafter coined or issued, shall be legal tender for all debts, public and private, public charges, taxes, duties, and dues, except that gold coins, when below the standard weight and limit of tolerance provided by law for the single piece, shall be legal tender only at valuation in proportion to their actual weight."

Approved, June 5, 1933, 4.40 p. m.